APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,172	11/18/2003	Diana Maria Cantu	1033-T00535	3909

34431   7590   08/05/2008
HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
150 S. WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 2100
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action ***Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***	10/716,172	CANTU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MIRANDA LE	2167	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: 1-33.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure* Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Miranda Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments do not overcome the final rejection.

In response to Applicant's arguments with respect to Bobo does not teach "using a received XML tag from a first XML-based message to identify a second XML-based communication message having been previously received from a first user, the first XML-based communication message being of a different communication medium than the second XML-based communication message", the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Contrary to Applicant's assertion, Bobo reads on the claimed limitation as follows:

XML tag to identify a second message limitation equates to message identifier, mailbox number, a page identifier of Bobo (i.e. After the user gains access to the mailbox at step 72, the user can request information stored within the MSDS 10. The MSDS 10 receives the request at step 76 and, at step 78, determines whether the information exists. As is common practice, the MSDS 10 also determines the validity of the request at step 78. The request from the user will include the mailbox number for the user, the message identifier, display preferences, and, if the message is a facsimile message, a page identifier. If for any reason the request is invalid, such as when a hacker is attempting to gain access to privileged information, the request for the information will be terminated, col. 8, lines 38-50).

a first message limitation equates to a search request of Bobo (i.e. In response to this request, the HTTPD 37 sends the user a search query form at step 322 to allow the user to define a desired search. An example of a search query form is shown in FIG. 19. The search query form may include an entry for each of the data fields 301 to 309 in the data entry 300. For instance, the user may input one or more names for a recipient and have the MSDS 10 search for all messages or files directed to just those recipients. The user may also indicate the type of document, such as whether it is a facsimile, voice message or data file. The search query form also has entries for the date or time, which preferably accept ranges of times and dates, and an entry for the telephone number of the caller to the MSDS 10. The search query form may also include an entry for the size of the file or for the number of pages, which is relevant if the message is a facsimile message. The search query form may also include an entry for the document number, which may accept a range of document numbers, and also an entry for another field, col. 24, line 57 to col. 25, line 7).

a first based communication message limitation equates to hypertext browser of Bobo, col. 8, lines 25-38.

the first or second database limitation equates to storage 11 of Bobo (i.e. An example of a data entry 300 in storage 11 for a message is shown in FIG. 17. The data entry 300 represents the entry for just a single message with each message having a separate data entry 300). It should be noted that, a first database equates to a data entry of Bobo, and a second database equates to another data entry of Bobo.

a second message limitation equates to voice, facsimile of col. 22, lines 65 to col. 23, line 10 (i.e. The MSDS 10 may store all messages, whether they are voice, facsimile, col. 22, line 65 to col. 23, line 10).

a second based communication message limitation equates to voice, facsimile of Bobo (i.e. The MSDS 10 may store all messages, whether they are voice, facsimile, col. 22, line 65 to col. 23, line 10).

Therefore, Boo teaches that the first based communication message, e.g. hypertext browser, and the second based communication message, e.g. voice, facsimile are different from each other.

The Bobo system cannot be distinguished from the claim invention since Bobo teaches all such elements as discussed above.

In response to Applicant's argument that the reference Bobo fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., analyzing) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).